

AMENDMENT
Request for Proposal

Amendment Date: January 7, 2013
Amendment Number: 1
Bid Event ID: EVT0001929
Closing Date: January 23, 2013, @ 2:00PM (CST)
Procurement Officer: Tami Sherley
Telephone: 785-296-3122
E-Mail Address: tami.sherley@da.ks.gov
Web Address: <http://da.ks.gov/purch>

Item: ***Kansas Commercial Registration, Alcoholic Beverage Control, Fuel Tax System (K-CRAFTS)***

Agency: Kansas Department of Revenue
Location(s): Topeka, Kansas

Period of Contract: Please see RFP Section 2.8

Conditions:

See the attached answers to questions submitted to Procurement and Contracts concerning the above mentioned RFP.

A signed copy of this Amendment must be submitted with your bid. If your bid response has been returned, submit this Amendment by the closing date indicated above.

I (We) have read and understand this amendment and agree it is a part of my (our) bid response.

NAME OF COMPANY OR FIRM: _____

SIGNED BY: _____

TITLE: _____ DATE: _____

Amendment Number 1 EVT0001929 was recently posted to the Procurement and Contracts' Internet website. **The bid document can be downloaded by going to the following website:**

<http://www.da.ks.gov/purch/RFQ/>

It is the vendor's responsibility to monitor the Procurement and Contracts' website on a regular basis for any changes/addenda.

1. Would the state accept a response from a vendor proposing an IRP/IFTA solution only, with the understanding that the IRP/IFTA vendor would need to work with the chosen ABC solution vendor for integration purposes?

Kansas requires one contract with a primary vendor identified.

2. Bid Event Section: (None). If available, what is the total budget or expected expenditure for the K-Crafts project (please advise any major items that would be included, such as hardware). Please itemize, if possible, one-time costs, annual costs, etc.

The budget will be based off of the selected bid.

3. Bid Event Section: (None). What GIS system(s), if any, does the State have in place to interface with an Alcoholic Beverage Control (Licensing, Enforcement and Case Management) solution?

ABC does not currently have a GIS system in place.

4. Bid Event Section: (None). During the last 18 months, which vendors have presented software demonstrations to the staff from the State of Kansas as it relates to this project.

Exploredata

FAST Enterprises, LLC

Xerox

Celtic

Computronix

GL Solutions

System Automation

IronData

5. Bid Event Section: Section 1.1, page 7, notes that the State intends to “select a single Contractor to provide an integrated “customer focused” system.”

Would the State accept:

- a. A separate proposal from a vendor (not as a subcontractor for the “single Contractor”) responding ONLY to the requirements of the ABC Liquor Licensing (Section 1.5), Liquor Taxes (Section 1.6), Cigarette and Tobacco (Section 1.7), and Drug Tax and Seized Property (Section 1.8), with the above systems and solutions integrating with the entire K-Craft project and system (IRP, IFTA, etc)?

Kansas requires one contract with a primary vendor identified.

- b. A response for the same requirements in Sections 1.5 through 1.8, but as a subcontractor of the prime, single Contractor. (If this option is required, does the State mandate that the subcontracting vendor identify and “partner” with a prime vendor for the RFP Response?).

We would be open to negotiating with the primary vendor and subcontractor. The subcontractor would have to offer software that would become fully incorporated into the primary vendor's software so as to appear seamless to the customer.

c. **Both response options (a & b) See above**

6. Given the sheer magnitude and volume of this request for proposals, the complexity of the requirements, and the release of the proposal just before the Christmas/New Year's holidays, we respectfully request a minimum 8-week extension of the due date for this proposal.

Due to the bid requirements, we cannot extend the due date for this proposal.

7. Is a response required in the Comments column for each item listed in the various "Fit Rating" Code attachments?

A response is required for any fit rating that is not SF for Standard Functionality.

8. IFTA records for 2009 – 2013 are to be converted. Does the State require conversion of all data, or only specific data such as accounts, returns, payments and credentials? Conversion of all data for registration purposes and all period data for last five (5) years is required, including any periods not in good standing (i.e. balance due, audit, hearing etc.)

Conversion requirements for IRP and ABC are identified in the RFP.

9. IFTA Functional Requirement 37.10 requires metric conversions for Canadian provinces. However, Section P1030.100 of the IFTA Procedures provides as follows for transmittals from US jurisdictions: "Transmittal reports submitted by a U.S. jurisdiction to a Canadian jurisdiction will be in U.S. customary measures and U.S. dollars. All funds transmitted by U.S. jurisdictions to Canadian jurisdictions will be forwarded in U.S. dollars." Please explain the instances in which metric conversions would be needed.

Metric conversion data is required for transmittal information received from some of the Canadian Jurisdictions. Currently metric conversion is required prior to posting information into our system.

10. IFTA Functional Requirement 38.21 references a 5-year charge-off project. Please explain that project in more detail. Kansas Department of Revenue currently requires a report each year of all accounts with a balance that has been delinquent for more than 5 years, and may be abated for one of the following reasons:
- Statute of Limitations Bars Collections;
 - Lack of Jurisdiction;
 - Domicile of the taxpayer is located outside of the state, and the taxpayer has no assets within the state of Kansas upon which the division of taxation may levy;
 - Insolvency of taxpayer;

- The taxpayer cannot be located;
- The taxpayer is receiving social security benefits, or social welfare payments and the taxpayer has no other assets upon which the division of taxation may levy;
- The taxpayer is mentally ill or physically incapacitated and circumstances indicate that the taxpayer will not be economically productive in the foreseeable future; or
- The administration and collection cost involved would not warrant collection of the amount due, and it will be to the advantage of the state to grant abatement of taxpayer's indebtedness;

Kansas Department of Revenue assumes this functionality would be a proposed abatement process. Court of Tax Appeals approval is required. Once approved the abatements would post, which allows financial impact to the tax account period.

The charge-off must also have “reversal functionality” to reassess the debt should a payment be received at a later date, due to collection of the debt resulting from a lien or tax warrant originally filed.

11. Section 1.1 RFP Purpose, Page 7 states, “the state desires the option of using its own programmers to add modules after implementation. Proposers are encouraged to bid this as an option.” We assume that if a vendor hosted solution is proposed then this desire does not need to be met?

It would still be a feasible option for the State even given a vendor hosted solution. Limitations, risks and constraints should be identified. The State's preference is to own the source code.

12. Section 1.4.9 IFTA Solution Description, Page 22 states that, “Proposers are encouraged to bid replacement of the other Motor Fuel taxes as additional modules to be converted after implementation of IFTA.” Please explain if the State is requesting a complete response with details on our motor fuel system and the cost for implementing.

Yes, Kansas would like to have the details for any motor fuel system and the cost for implementing.

13. Section 2.2 Resource Requirements, Page 56 states that, “The Vendor Project Manager (VPM) will be onsite during discovery, design, conversion, implementation, unit testing, integration testing, end-to-end testing of the system and training of the KDOR staff.” We assume the State's intention is to have the VPM onsite in Kansas for the culmination/presentation of each milestone and not for the entire duration of each milestone – please confirm.

Preference is to have the VPM onsite for the duration of the project, but cost may be a constraint.